

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**BECKLEY DIVISION**

ROBERT ODOM,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:16-cv-8596

DAVE YOUNG,

Respondent.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

On September 6, 2016, the Petitioner, proceeding *pro se*, filed his *Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of Habeas Corpus By a Person in State or Federal Custody* (Document 1).

On January 9, 2018, the Respondent filed a *Motion to Dismiss Petition* (Document 11).

By *Standing Order* (Document 3) entered on September 7, 2016, the matter was referred to the Honorable Cheryl A. Eifert, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission to this Court of proposed findings of fact and recommendation for disposition, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On January 29, 2018, the Magistrate Judge submitted a *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* (Document 12) wherein it is recommended that the Respondent's *Motion to Dismiss Petition* (Document 11) be granted, the Petitioner's *Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of Habeas Corpus By a Person in State or Federal Custody* (Document 1) be dismissed, and this matter be


removed from the Court's docket. Objections to the Magistrate Judge's *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* were due by February 15, 2018.<sup>1</sup>

Neither party has timely filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's *Proposed Findings and Recommendation*. The Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and the Petitioner's right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984).

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** and incorporates herein the findings and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as contained in the *Proposed Findings and Recommendation*, and **ORDERS** that the Respondent's *Motion to Dismiss Petition* (Document 11) be **GRANTED**, the Petitioner's *Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of Habeas Corpus By a Person in State or Federal Custody* (Document 1) be **DISMISSED**, and this matter be **REMOVED** from the Court's docket.

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a certified copy of this Order to Magistrate Judge Eifert, counsel of record, and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: February 20, 2018

  
IRENE C. BERGER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

---

<sup>1</sup>The docket reflects that the *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* mailed to the Petitioner was returned as undeliverable on February 5, 2018.